



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231

	•			
APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/753,656	01/04/2001	Peter Forsell	2333-69	1846
	7590 10/01/2002	RECEIVED		
	ANDERHYE P.C.	HECEIVED	EXAMINER	
8th Floor 1100 North Gl	ebe Road	FEB 0 4 2003	CADUGAN, JOSEPH A	
Arlington, VA	22201 4714 E		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	\\ \tag{5}	DEAN L. GARNER	3736	
	MAR 1 8 2003 W	•	DATE MAILED: 10/01/2002	
	MAIT 1 0 2000	*	·	
	1			•

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

DOCKETED

CLT/MATTER # 2333-69
MAIL DATE 10-1-02
DUE DATE 10-1-02
NAL DEADLINE 1001 1, 2003
OCKETED BY part 115

COPY FORWARDED TO ASSIGNEE

DATE: SIGNED: CEIL SURMAN

PATENT INFORMATION
SERVICES

JAN 28 2003

TO FILE REFER TO

PTO-90C (Rev. 07-01)

*	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/753,656	FORSELL, PETER
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	Joseph A. Cadugan	3736
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply		
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	66(a). In no event, however, may a reply be time within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days fill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE.	s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication.
Status	·	
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on	 :	
	s action is non-final.	
 Since this application is in condition for allowa closed in accordance with the practice under I Disposition of Claims 	nce except for formal matters, pr Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 4	osecution as to the ments is 53 O.G. 213.
4) Claim(s) is/are pending in the application	an	
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw		
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.	m nom consideration.	•
6) Claim(s) is/are rejected.		
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.		•
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	election requirement	
Application Papers	coolon requirement.	
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner		
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accept		niner .
Applicant may not request that any objection to the		
11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on		
If approved, corrected drawings are required in rep		
12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Exa	•	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign	priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)	-(d) or (f)
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	(4) 57 (1).
1. Certified copies of the priority documents	have been received	
2. Certified copies of the priority documents		on No
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priori application from the International Bure	ty documents have been receive	
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of	of the certified copies not received	1.
14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic	priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
 a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language prov 15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic 	visional application has been rece	eived.
Attachment(s)		
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s)		(PTO-413) Paper No(s) atent Application (PTO-152)



Art Unit: 3736

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species of the claimed invention: one species utilizes a timer, the other a sensor, to control the restriction of the food flow device. Further there are two distinct species, shown in the drawings in Figures 2 and 3 and described in the disclosure. When applicant elects one type of control, an election should also be made between the embodiment that pumps fluid from a reservoir into the restriction device and the embodiment that pumps fluid between one half of the restriction device and the other. If applicant decides to traverse one part of the election but not the other, applicant should include a list of the claims which read on the elected species of which election applicant does not traverse.

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable.

Currently, no claims are held generic. If applicant feels that some claims are generic, they should be listed.

Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

A telephone call was made to Bob Molan on 26 September 2002 to request an oral election to the 2. ' above restriction requirement, but did not result in an election being made.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143).

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Joseph A. Cadugan whose telephone number is (703) 305-0879. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday and alternate Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor. Kevin P. Shaver can be reached on (703) 308-2582. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 872-9302 for regular communications and (703) 872-9303 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0858.

Joseph A. Cadugan

September 26, 2002

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3700